

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of February 3, 2006 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claim 20 has been amended, claims 27-39 have been cancelled, and claims 40-58 have been added. Applicants submit that these new claims are fully supported by the specification, and thus introduce no new matter to the application. Claims 20 and 40-58 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Preliminarily, Applicants note with appreciation the courtesies extended by Examiner Bonshock and Examiner Bayerl to the undersigned and Mr. Brisnehan during and subsequent to the interview of March 8, 2006. At least some of the comments below encompass the totality of the issues discussed during the interview, and, as such, provide the substance of the interview in accord with MPEP § 713.04.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), as being anticipated by Poole, “Mac OS 8.5 Bible” (*Poole*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. As amended, claim 20 recites, in part, “storing by the operating system a value corresponding to the first property for the first file,” “storing by the operating system a value corresponding to the second property for the second file wherein the second property is different from the first property,” and “displaying [the first and second value] at the same location relative to a graphical representation of the [file].” In *Poole*, all properties are present in the same location relative to each item, even if the property has a null value. Counter to the claims in the present application, the regions of *Poole*’s display screen will either be used to display the value of the one property designated to that area, or will not be used at all. Therefore, *Poole* does not teach displaying property values of different files at the same location relative to the file, “wherein the second property is different from the first property,” as recited in claim 20. For this reason, Applicants submit that claim 20, related computer readable media claim 44, and their respective dependent claims 40-43 and 45-48 are allowable over the art of record.

New Claims

Additionally, dependent claims 40 and 45 recite, in part, “the value corresponding to the first property for the first file and the value corresponding to the second property for the second file are authored by the operating system.” Regarding *Poole*, especially Figure 6-17 on page 131, the Office Action states:

This shows that the user has the ability to decide which items are in the relevant group properties and or create items that pertain to the type, whether these items are unique to a specific type of item or not. Taking a closer look at the example on page 131, Poole shows “Labels” including: “HOT”, “Essential”, “In Progress”, “Cool”, and “Project 1”. These “Labels” are clearly different properties, in the same location relative to the described file.

Office Action, p. 11-12 (Emphasis added). While Applicants respectfully disagree with this characterization of *Poole*’s “Labels,” the values for *Poole*’s “Label” property and similar properties are undoubtedly authored by the user. *Poole*’s custom properties are never “authored by the operating system,” as recited in claims 40 and 45. Accordingly, these claims are allowable over *Poole* and the art of record for this additional reason.

Similarly dependent claims 41 and 46 recite, “wherein the first property and second property are not user-assignable properties.” For the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 40, claims 41 and 46 are allowable over *Poole* and the art of record.

New independent claim 49 recites a method with the additional features of memory locations “dedicated by said operating system to storing a value of a[n] enumerated property,” and “displaying, at the same location relative to the graphical representation of the file[s], data based on the value[s] stored in the ... dedicated memory location[s].” In *Poole*, the only possible way to display values of different properties at the same relative location is for the user to manually set the value of a user-assignable property to the value of a different property on the same file. Thus, in *Poole*, dedicated memory locations for storing values of the same property are never displayed at different relative locations. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 49, related computer readable media claim 54, and their respective dependent claims 50-53 and 55-58 are allowable over the art of record.

Additionally, claims 50 and 55 recite, “wherein the value associated with the first file and the value associated with the second file are assigned by the operating system,” while claims 51 and 56 recite, “wherein the first enumerated property and second enumerated property are not user-assignable properties.” For the reasons discussed above with relation to claims 40 and 41, these claims are allowable over *Poole* and the art of record.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3223.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 3rd day of April, 2006

By:

/Gary D. Fedorochko/
Gary D. Fedorochko
Reg. No. 35,509

Application No.: 09/832,966
Response to Final Office Action dated February 3, 2006
Amendment Dated May 3, 2006

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597